UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/588,213	08/02/2006	Oral Aydin	293602US0PCT	6595	
	7590 01/27/201 AK, MCCLELLAND 1	EXAMINER			
1940 DUKE STREET			ZHAO, XIAO SI		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1792			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/27/2010	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/588,213	AYDIN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	AIAO ZI IAO	1792	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 January 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidaveal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, with 37 CFR 41.31; o	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Action of event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra transfer of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b			cause
(a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further cor		TE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	parraepanding number of finally rei	acted claims	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 ⁻²		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amondment (DTOL 324)
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		mpliant Amendment (F 10L-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s). Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alled 		timaly filed amondmor	ot cancoling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owable ii subifilited iii a separate,	umely med amendmen	it cancelling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>12-24</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	I sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.		n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	r 1 0/56/06) Paper No(s)		
/Michael Kornakov/	/Xiao S Zhao/		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792	Examiner, Art Unit 1792		
	·		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment to claim 12 changes the scope of the dependent claims which may require additional consideration and possibly search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that polyvinyl alcohol does not have adhesive properties and that the PVA disclosed in Hughes et al. is disclosed as a part of a photographic layer. Even if the PVA has adhesive properties, there is no indication that this photographic layer functions as an adhesive. This argument is not persuasive. First, Faris (US 5,364,557), claim 13, mentions the inherent adhesive properties of polyvinyl alcohol. Second, since PVA has adhesive properties, it inherently functions as an adhesive. Applicants argue that Kitamura et al. is irrelevant since its objective is to provide for something different than the instant invention and it discloses and suggests nothing concerning a free falling curtain coating of one or more layers within one operation. This is not persuasive because the rejection of claim 14 was made over Hughes et al. in view of Kitamura et al. The significance of the Kitamura reference was to show that ink receiving layers are used when forming photographic images and that said layers can be high-gloss films. One cannot show unobviousness by attacking references individually when the rejection as a whole was based on a combination of references. This same logic applies to the arguments against Yoshioka et al. Furthermore, applicants' arguments at least in part are based on the amendment, which is not entered.